



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

37

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/697,419	10/30/2003	Stacey Patterson	6704-30	7565
43463	7590	03/24/2006	EXAMINER	
RUDEN, MCCLOSKY, SMITH, SCHUSTER & RUSSELL, P.A. 222 LAKEVIEW AVE SUITE 800 WEST PALM BEACH, FL 33401-6112			CHOWDHURY, IQBAL HOSSAIN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1652	

DATE MAILED: 03/24/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/697,419	PATTERSON ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Iqbal Chowdhury, Ph.D.	1652

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-33 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) 1-33 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claims 1-4, 7-14, drawn to isolated polynucleotide comprising codon-optimized nucleotide sequence of SEQ ID NO: 1 encoding bacterial LuxA protein, expression cassette, and host cell, classified in class 435, subclass 252.3.
 - II. Claims 1-2, 5-6, 7-12, 15-18, drawn to isolated polynucleotide comprising codon-optimized nucleotide sequence of SEQ ID NO: 2 encoding bacterial LuxB protein, expression cassette, and host cell, classified in class 435, subclass 252.3.
 - III. Claims 19-22, 25-26, drawn to a method of introducing nucleic acid encoding LuxA protein, classified in class 435, subclass 6.
 - IV. Claims 19-20, 23-26, drawn to a method of introducing nucleic acid encoding LuxB protein, classified in class 435, subclass 6.
 - V. Claim 27-28, 30, drawn to a method of making nucleic acid comprising nucleic acid encoding LuxA protein and codon substitution to produce higher level of LuxA protein, classified in class 435, subclass 6.
 - VI. Claim 27, 29-30, drawn to a method of making nucleic acid comprising nucleic acid encoding LuxB protein and codon substitution to produce higher level of LuxB protein, classified in class 435, subclass 6.
 - VII. Claim 31-33, drawn to a kit analyzing gene expression of LuxA protein, classified in class 435, subclass 6.

VIII. Claim 31-33, drawn to a kit analyzing gene expression of LuxB protein, classified in class 435, subclass 6.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

2. The DNA of Group I and II, the proteins of Group III and IV and kits of Group VII and VIII, are each comprises a chemically unrelated structure capable of separate manufacture, use and effect. The DNA of Group I and II comprise a nucleic acid sequence and the proteins of Group III and IV each comprise unrelated amino acid sequences and kits of Group VII and VIII comprises multiple nucleic acid sequence. The DNA has other utility besides encoding the proteins or making kit such hybridization or probe, the proteins can be made by another method such as isolation from natural sources or chemical synthesis and kit can be made by using polypeptide or antibody.

3. Inventions I and III, are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the nucleic acid can be used in in vitro translation system to produce polypeptide in acellular system.

4. Inventions II and IV are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP

Art Unit: 1652

§ 806.05(h)). In the instant case the nucleic acid can be used in in vitro translation system to produce polypeptide in acellular system.

5. Inventions I and V are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the nucleic acid can be used in in vitro translation system to produce polypeptide in acellular system.

6. Inventions II and VI are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the nucleic acid can be used in in vitro translation system to produce polypeptide in acellular system.

7. Inventions VII-VIII and III-VI are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the Groups III-VI, which are methods of introducing nucleic acid and methods of making nucleic acid and kits of Group VII and VIII as kits of Group VII and VIII are neither made nor used by methods of Groups III-VI.

8. The methods of groups III-VI are patentably distinct as they comprise unrelated steps, as different products and produce different effects.

In addition, this application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention: Groups I-VIII includes use of codon substitution as recited in claims 2, 12, 20 and 27. The species are: TTT, TTA, ATT, GTT, TCT, CCA, ACT, GCA, TAT, CAT, CAA, AAT, AAA, GAT, GAA, TGT, CGT, AGT, and GGT for each LuxA and LuxB.

The genes encoding proteins of LuxA and LuxB comprising of all the codon substitutions species are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions represent structurally different polypeptides and polynucleotide encoding them. Therefore, where structural identity is required, such as for hybridization or expression or antibody binding, the different sequences have different effects.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP §

809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37CFR 1.48b if one or more of the currently named inventors are no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a petition under CFR 1.48 (b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17 (i).

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. **Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product** will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection

Art Unit: 1652

are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See “Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of In re Ochiai, In re Brouwer and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b),” 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.** Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Applicant is advised the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Iqbal H. Chowdhury whose telephone number is 571-272-8137. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00-5:00.

Art Unit: 1652

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ponnathapu Achutamurthy can be reached on 703-272-0928. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Respectfully,

Iqbal Chowdhury, PhD, Patent Examiner
Art Unit 1652 (Recombinant Enzymes)
US Patent and Trademark Office
Rm. Remsen 2B69, Mail Box. 2C70
Ph. (571)-272-8137, Fax. (571)-273-8137
IC



PONNATHAPU ACHUTAMURTHY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600